DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 034 JC 740 163

AUTHOR	Brawer, Florence B.
TITLE	Three Colleges: Three Faculties.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TP-41
PUB DATE	Jun 74
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Comparative Analysis; Guides; Instructional Staff; Post Secondary Education; Staff Improvement; *Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics

ABSTRACT

To develop guidelines for institutional assessment that consider the specific characteristics of junior colleges, student bodies, faculties, and administrative staffs, faculty members of three community colleges were studied in terms of demographic characteristics, values, and emphases of college programs. The three schools from which the subjects were drawn were located within a 75-mile radius of Los Angeles. All data were collected by means of a Staff Survey that was administered to the three faculty groups. The study findings suggest that while faculty members are fairly similar across the schools, differences do exist intrainstitutionally. Thus, it would seem advisable to prepare programs and emphasize institutional processes that address the faculty as developing human beings. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 091034

THREE COLLEGES: THREE FACULTIES

Florence B. Brawer

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

Graduate School of Education and the University Library
University of California
Los Angeles 90024

Topical Paper No. 41
June 1974

JC 740 167

The material in this Topical Paper was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the League for Innovation in the Community College for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the League for Innovation in the Community College or the National Institute of Education.

TOPICAL PAPERS

1. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education. July 1968. ED 022 479.

2. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 2: Attitude Assessment. November 1968. ED 026 050.

3. Student Activism and the Junior College Administrator: Judicial Guidelines. December 1968. ED 026 039.

4. Students as Teachers. January 1969. ED 026 999.

5. Is Anyone Learning to Write? February 1969. ED 030 422.

6. Is It Really a Better Technique? March 1969. ED 030 410.

7. A Developmental Research Plan for Junior College Remedial Education; Number 3: Concept Formation. August 1969. ED 032 072.

8. The Junior College in International Perspective. January 1970. ED 025 417.

9. Identifying the Effective Instructor. January 1970. ED 035 416.

10. Financing Higher Education: A Proposal. February 1970. ED 037 206.

11. The Person: A Conceptual Synthesis. March 1970. ED 037 219.

12. The Position Papers of Black Student Activists. September 1970. ED 042 453.

13. Case Studies in Multi-Media Instruction. October 1970. ED 044 098.

14. The Laws Relating to Higher Education in the Fifty States. January 1965-December 1967. October 1970. ED 044 097.

15. Nationwide Pilot Study on Articulation. December 1970. ED 045 065.

16. The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism. January 1971. ED 046 390.

17. The Dynamic Interaction of Student and Teacher. February 1971. ED 046 395.

18. Directions for Research and Innovation in Junior College Reading Programs. February 1971. ED 046 396.

19. Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. April 1971. ED 049 729.

20. Skill Development in Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971. ED 048 859.

21. Community College Reading Center Facilities. May 1971. ED 051 792.

22. Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst. May 1971. ED 050 709.

23. Exemplary Practices in Junior College Reading Instruction. May 1971. ED 050 710.

24. Training Faculty for Junior College Reading Programs. May 1971. ED 050 711.

25. Extending Environmental Research to the Community College. August 1971. ED 053 724.

26. A Student Volunteer Services Bureau. August 1971. ED 053 719.

27. The College of the Whole Earth. October 1971. ED 055 588.

28. The Professional President: A Decade of Community Junior College Chief Executives. January 1972. ED 058 881.

29. The Financial Crisis in the Community College. February 1972. ED 058 873.

30. The Practitioner Views Institutional Research. February 1972. ED 059 718.

31. After the Open Door: An Approach to Developmental Education. March 1972. ED 059 714.

32. Group Counseling of Minority and Low-Income Women Students: A Model Program for Community College Educators. March 1972. ED 059 715.

33. The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation. April 1972. ED 060 839.

34. Do Students Want Individualized Instruction? July 1972. ED 063 931.

35. Study and Travel Programs Abroad: Guidelines for Two-Year College Students. July 1972. ED 063 914.

36. Personality Orientations and Vocational Choice in Community College. Students. December 1973. ED 083 979.

37. A comparison of the Personality Characteristics of Community College Student Dropouts and Persisters. December 1973. ED 083 980

38. The Department/Division Structure in the Community College. December 1973. ED 085 051

39. The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges. March 1974.

40. The Department/Division Chairmen: Characteristics and Role in the Community College. May 1974.

41. Three Colleges: Three Faculties. June 1974.

Copies of back issues are available (by ED number) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Md. 20014. Hard copy (HC) is $3.29 per units of 100 pages or less; microfiche (MF) is $.65 per title, regardless of size. Payment must accompany orders of $10.00 or less and should include sales tax where applicable.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 21 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

THREE COLLEGES: THREE FACULTIES

by

Florence B. Brawer

All the waves of external demands for staff members who are sympathetic to the "new" students and who can take colleges down the road toward their new mission of serving the community splash against the current faculty. For the most part, these are people who were employed in a different era, when the colleges had a different primary function. They selected themselves into the institutions with that function in mind, and adopted a role commensurate. They are there and will be there for a generation at least. They cannot be ignored or shunted aside.

Who are they? How do they fit their community's needs? To what extent do they differ in colleges in one or another type of community? This paper emphasizes the importance of understanding faculty, presents data about college instructors drawn from a number of sources across the nation, compares faculties in three proximate but diverse community colleges, and returns once more to the importance of examining faculty by dealing with specific issues that confront them.

PERSPECTIVES

Colleges are most often identified by such characteristics as their location; their classification as private or public, liberal arts or university; their physical properties; or the types of students they enroll. Although the teaching staff of any institution is ostensibly responsible for its effects on its students, schools are less often seen in terms of their

faculties. Awareness of the identity of its key personnel--students, administrators, counselors, and faculty--is crucial to the image of any school, but, as McKeachie notes, (1966) studies of faculty characteristics are lacking. And when reports about faculty characteristics and/or faculty effectiveness are available, they are often marred by confusion and conflict. Indeed, despite the fairly pervasive emphasis on these issues, fifty years of reports (1900-1955) have revealed little conclusive information. Many studies produce insignificant results--especially those that deal with personality variables and provide findings that are very pedestrian. This poverty of meaningful "efforts to investigate teacher personalities...(have been) conducted in a 'theoretical vacuum'...and relied upon a single criterion of teacher effectiveness (for example, the ideal teacher)" (Brawer, 1968, p. 7).

Approximately a quarter of a million Americans are now engaged in college and university teaching. Yet our knowledge about instructors is either sketchy and general or else biographical and centered on a few outstanding individuals. This meager information base applies in particular to the comparatively new community/junior college teacher. Unfortunately, there is still a dearth of certain kinds of information about the junior college instructor who may teach

> many courses similar to those in the lower division of the university...serves on college committees, selects instructional materials, advises students, and engages in other activities that fall within the commonly held definition of "teaching." He is expected to be innovative...must teach

> many students who have been classified as remedial...(and) must reconcile himself to a large dropout rate...handle large numbers of students...(and) must also realize that the community itself keeps close watch on his manners and mores.
>
> Beyond such general information, what do we know about the instructors themselves?...(most studies of community college faculty)...deal with rather singular variables that are limited in their scope and in their implications. Hendrix (1964), for example, found that institutional policies regarding rank, tenure, and evaluation were related to such diverse--and possibly irrelevant--faculty life--record data as employment status, father's and mother's education, father's birthplace, varsity athletics, and debate participation. Brawer (1968) reviewed the literature on personality characteristics of college and university faculty members, (as they relate)...to junior college instructors. Other studies have focused on the characteristics of people in junior college teacher preparation programs (Cohen and Brawer, 1968)...faculty orientation (Kelly and Connolly, 1970), the evaluation of instructors (Cohen and Brawer, 1969), credentialing (American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966), and related issues (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, pp. 14-15).

At least two books (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, and Kelley and Wilbur, 1970) are devoted particularly to community college instructors. However, most published reports about these faculty members are either parochial, indigenous to the schools in which they work, or subsumed in the literature about

instructors at a number of colleges and universities. And while "Descriptive studies of college and university faculty are neither new nor uncommon... typically, the comprehensiveness and diversity of the information collected and reported is inversely related to the sample size" (Bayer, 1970, p. 1). Large surveys usually involve short questionnaires and studies more limited in scope employ longer instruments and thus ostensibly provide more in-depth material.

Even when exceptions occur, other issues are at stake. No matter how well conceptualized a study, effective the methodology, or relevant the results, it is difficult to understand an institution unless it is compared with similar institutions. Yet, comparisons are difficult when the materials reported vary.

There are many reasons for gathering material about community college faculty: staff development (O'Banion, 1972), satisfaction (Frankel, 1973), the meaning of schools in general (Jencks, 1972), accountability, and in order to understand the people component of the contemporary community college. One reason for presenting material about faculty in three colleges is to form a basis for comparing different types of institutions and to see what impact these institutions have on the faculty themselves. Information presented in a vacuum, however, is seldom useful and raises a number of important questions. How, for example, can we characterize the quarter of a million Americans who are engaged in college and university teaching? Do we talk about the degrees they hold, the life styles they manifest, or the courses they teach? Do we try to assign a relationship between type of person and teaching effectiveness or do we leave the question of performance to those who are almost solely concerned with evaluation and accountability?

There are approximately 96,000 people who teach in public and private junior/community colleges. Understandably there is no single approach to describing them, no one avenue toward either definition or understanding. The sociological and psychological research on college faculty--general characteristics, typologies, selection, training and innovations--has been summarized by Brawer (1968) who, taking an eclectic approach, suggests that there is no one type of person who can be called instructor, no one way of selecting a faculty member, and no one road to understanding him.

Since personality characteristics play an important role in any assessment scheme, they were also considered in a monograph on evaluation by Cohen and Brawer (1969). Reasons "for using student achievement of learning objectives as the main criterion upon which studies of faculty and of instructional effect should be based" (p. 57) are presented together with designs for assessing instructors.

In Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor (Cohen and Brawer, 1972), a plea is made for maturity through personal identity and awareness of self--a sense of directedness toward professional development. This book comments on the way the mature instructor operates, arranges "procedures so that he tends to judge himself--and to be judged--by his efforts. Whatever role he plays--model, mediator, or instructional manager--he must be his own mentor. He adopts particular functions because they suit his personality and the needs of the institution and the people he serves. He adjusts his activities to his effects on his students. He becomes a professional instructor--one who causes learning. In his persistent search for consciousness of who he is, he continually asks himself, 'Is it important to

my students that I be what I am?' (p. 221).... Indeed, the mature instructor who would enhance institutional and professional maturity...must know well what he is about and accept himself as a many-faceted, ever-developing human being" (p. 222).

Although another approach taken by these authors (Cohen and Associates, 1971) is less theoretical, the point is made once more that we actually know little about the professional activities of two-year college instructors. This situation exists despite Garrison's (1967) landmark study of faculty attitudes and perceptions; and other less cited but interesting accounts of faculty in colleges throughout the country, for example, Hamill (1967), Hunt (1964), Rogers (1965), Riess (1967).

Community colleges and the forces impinging on them may be viewed from several perspectives, just as may the people who function in them. From a sociological perspective on faculty power, for example, Barrett (1969) notes that a sense of power was related to satisfaction among faculty in North Carolina community colleges, while Blackburn and Bylsma (1971) report that the decision-making power of Michigan junior colleges faculties had increased in all areas relating to their welfare--workload, class size, salaries--since collective bargaining practices were implemented in 1965. At the same time, these same bargaining procedures resulted in a more tightly structured bureaucracy in that the roles of both faculty and administrators were more specifically defined.

When the psychological approach is taken, included are such encompassing variables as values and attitudes (Blai, 1972; Garrison, 1967; Koile and Tatem, 1966); personality characteristics of instructors (Brawer, 1968;

Friedman, 1965) and institutional personality (Gelso and Sims, 1968; Lofquist and Dawis, 1969; Park, 1971; Wilson; and Gaff, 1969). Using Blai's (1972) investigation as an example of this type of approach, we find that his private junior college faculty members, examined in terms of their rankings of Rokeach's (1968) Terminal and Instrumental Values (Rokeach, 1968), also thought their students wanted them to know their subject matter, be available for individual conferences, offer interesting lectures, specify learning objectives and "teach them to think."

The demographic approach is the most popular; indeed, we find that the majority of studies of college instructors as well as students focus on the compilation of actuarial or demographic data. Medsker and Tillery (1971), for example, report findings from a survey of 4,000 instructors taken from a stratified sample of 57 community colleges throughout the country. They note that: 1) Community college staffs are composed primarily of people in the 31 to 50 year age bracket; 2) The master's degree is generally the highest degree held by most instructors; 3) Staff members are recruited from a wide variety of sources, with almost 33 1/3% of the respondents coming from the public school system, 22% moving to the junior college directly from graduate school, 11% entering junior college teaching from positions in four-year institutions, 10% moving in from business and industry, and the remainder coming from various other sources; 4) Finally, few junior college faculty members are from minority ethnic groups; and 5) "The social class background of many white staff members makes it difficult for them to relate to students from various ethnic groups" (1971, p. 90). These data were derived from an earlier survey and some changes might better reflect the 1970's, especially in

regard to the third conclusion about selection and recruitment, but the last two points demand special consideration in light of current demands that faculty be seen as relevant and sympathetic to their students.

These studies--whether psychological, sociological, economic or political--provide information about aggregates of people, a number of instructors all viewed as a total. Other investigations establish subsets by comparing one group with another,--albeit from different kinds of institutions. A report by Bayer (1973) and one by Eckert and Williams (1972) are particularly notable in this context because they examine college faculties in a number of institutions along a variety of dimensions. In both these surveys, two-year college faculty members were studied along with professors at universities and liberal arts colleges, comparisons being made among the respondents in terms of institutional affiliation. In both, the samples were large--Bayer drawing from 2,432 institutions of higher education across the country and Eckert and Williams dealing with 43 colleges and universities in Minnesota. In the national study, 42,345 teaching faculty were represented while 1,383 faculty constituted the sample of the state study. And both investigations used earlier studies that had been conducted on similar populations who were queried on similar variables, (Bayer, 1970; Eckert and Stecklein, 1961) as bases for further comparisons.

The major emphasis of the Minnesota study was the way in which college faculty view themselves and their jobs. The 1,035 men and 348 women surveyed were found to vary along specific lines. For example, approximately 75% of the respondents in both the four-year institutions and the public junior colleges were men, as compared to only 58% of the private junior college group.

Median age for the four-year school instructors was 42 years; for the junior colleges, 41 (public) and 43 (private). Greater differences were found in terms of original geographic base, 32% of the four-year sample and 56% of the public junior college sample being born in Minnesota. Three-fourths of the respondents were married at the time they were surveyed and most of these (70%) had at least one child.

Career preparation sequences for two groups--four-year college and university people versus two-year college faculties--were also compared. The greatest difference here was in terms of the highest degree held by respondents, the most popular degree for junior college instructors being the masters.

Although the most frequently cited reason for choosing a particular type of institution in which to work was freedom and independence, public junior college instructors indicated they liked the age and the type of students with whom they associated. Satisfactions were expressed in various ways, the junior college respondents appearing to look to students as greater sources of satisfaction than either relationships with colleagues or research appointments.

The American Council on Education surveys of college and university faculties are considerably broader in scope than similar projects but they are primarily statistical rather than interpretative in nature (Bayer, 1970; 1973). The 1970 document includes information from 303 institutions--57 junior colleges, 168 four-year colleges, and 78 universities - and data are grouped into five categories: demographic and background characteristics; professional background and academic activity; attitudes toward education,

faculty, and the profession; political preferences and attitudes toward social issues; and protest participation and campus activism (1970, p. 6). This information is reported in terms of the total group of respondents as well as three subgroups: two-year colleges, four-year colleges, and universities. Since responses to questionnaire items are best seen in tabular form, it is suggested that the interested reader go to the original source (either the 1970 or 1973 Bayer reports) rather than read a cursory summary here. Summarily, though, in terms of demographic characteristics, these findings seem consistent with those of Eckert and Williams.

Yet another look at faculties in various kinds of institutions was undertaken by Berkeley's Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, with 1,069 subjects representing six schools in three states (a large public university, a small and a medium-sized private university, a large state college, a medium-sized public junior college, and a small private liberal arts college). (Wilson and Gaff, 1969) Noteworthy in that it presents a view of faculty based on ideological grounds rather than demographic or personality characteristics, this study assessed opinions regarding student participation in campus governance. Of interest too, is Morey's (1972) review of 106 documents pertaining to traits, preparation, and evaluation of community college faculty who must contend with such elements as a wide diversity of students; professional isolation from the "community of scholars"; a teaching schedule that may include several areas of specialization and teaching loads ranging between 15-18 hours/week; nonteaching assignments, such as academic advisement, counseling, supervision of student activities, and committee memberships, all of which aggravate their greatest problem--time; and a median salary (in public junior colleges in 1970) of $10,850,

with salary schedules based upon experience and length of service.

Increasingly, faculty are being recruited from graduate schools, industry, the professions, and four-year colleges, rather than from high school, as was generally the case ten years ago. Siehr (1963), Gleazer (1967), Kelly and Connolly (1970) suggest a marked and consistent trend toward the master's degree for faculty, at least forty percent of faculty entering the junior colleges with no previous teaching experience, diversity in terms of personal characteristics, academic preparation, and previous job experiences. Faculty frequently disagree with the stated institutional purposes of their colleges (particularly concerning the value and appropriateness of occupational and remedial programs) and there is evidence of demographic and educational differences among teachers with high or low acceptance of their institution's goals. At the same time, high agreement exists among faculty in identifying their most important work-geared problems, which include lack of office space, motivating students, lack of professional refreshment and unfamiliarity with transfer requirements.

Purdy (1973) takes a different slant by assuming a participant observation approach to intensely study faculty in one California community college, and to attend to the "relationships between faculty members and...[their] need for autonomy as these factors related to use of 'innovative' or experimental instructional techniques" (p. 55). Her major conclusions stemming from this in-depth investigation are that the sense of autonomy is the most important characteristic in determining the faculty member's attitudes toward innovation and, further, that a definite relationship exists between faculty perceptions of administrators as respecting their "need for autonomy and openness to changing teaching practices" (p. 56).

Project Focus, a nationwide study of the community college, provides still another basis for information about faculty, students, and presidents. From an initial sampling of 2,741, useable data were obtained from 2,491 faculty members. Bushnell (1973) alludes to the types of material obtained as well as the reason for this survey when he writes: "Not a great deal is known about the two-year college faculty member other than normative data on degrees earned, salary status, and previous work experience. How satisfied faculty members are with their work and how they see themselves in comparison with faculty members of other institutions of higher education has been the focus of a number of studies. What training they have received and the value of that experience has been a point of contention between critics and supporters of two-year colleges for years." (p. 30) Previous experience, aspirations, and attitudes about work serve as both a focus for this report and a basis for comparing faculty and student populations. A marked consistency in terms of teaching experience and degrees held pervades among the findings of Bushnell, Bayer, and Eckert and Williams .

While faculty studies generally stress demographic characteristics and then add some special twist, occasionally some discuss the extent to which these same instructors endorse stated institutional purposes. Bushnell (1973), points out that although his data are not definitive, they do support the earlier observation by Medsker (1960) that

> a number of faculty members identify more closely with their counterparts in four-year institutions than with their own colleagues. Nearly one-third of the Bushnell respondents felt that students in community junior colleges should be screened more carefully while many faculty members did not

fully endorse the concept of the open door, a major tenet of the community college program. (p. 39).

At the same time, Bushnell reported a high degree of agreement between the rank-ordering of the same set of goals by both presidents and faculty. Points of consensus included "Serving the higher educational needs of youth from the surrounding community, helping students develop a respect for their own abilities and an understanding of their limitations, responding to the needs of the local community, and helping students acquire the ability to adapt to new occupational requirements as technology and society change... [However, while presidents] tend to emphasize responding to community needs more strongly...faculty place greater stress on the students' personal development" (p. 48). Despite such evinced dedication to personal development in their students, faculty frequently continue to adopt a double standard--not always feeling that students should share an equal voice on policy matters--and both faculty and student groups felt they were not sufficiently involved in decision-making.

A "clearer understanding of the existing attitude patterns of faculty with various career experiences is needed" (Patterson, 1971, p. 108) if community colleges are to be successful in helping faculty implement their objectives, philosophy and programs into practice. In order to gain such understanding, a study of Pennsylvania college faculty set out to determine the relationship between previous career experiences and attitudes toward educational issues. It was found that faculty who had not held previous assignments were more progressive than faculty in five other categories: Public School, Junior College, Four-Year College, Graduate Study, Business

or Industry and Other Employment. These "progressive respondents" may well be the ones who, in improving their own approaches to instruction, will be the prime movers toward the achievement of institutional goals, a statement that is fairly consistent with Williams (1970) who reported that those faculty members who have opportunities to be involved in policy formulation are in the process of changing from their own traditional roles of noninvolvement toward an increasingly more active participation in their school's governance.

Other approaches have been taken in order to look at the relationships of individual instructors and institutions. Bloom and Freedman (1973), for example, report certain significant subgroup differences among several hundred college faculties in different institutions--between scientists and humanists, research-oriented professors and teachers, and "cosmopolitan" faculty and "local" oriented faculty. When comparing attitudes of junior college instructors who identified with the purposes of the junior college and those more closely identified with the senior college, Medsker and Tillery (1971) note that a large number of instructors (43%) oriented themselves toward the senior college. The same group consistently supported the liberal arts aspects of the junior college while rejecting its "comprehensive" functions. Those instructors who had never attended a junior college and taught in an applied area rejected three of five functions descriptive of the junior college, including both remedial and community services functions; felt that admission requirements should not be different for different students; and rejected the importance of vocational work for adults. Apparently a relationship exists between reference group attitudes and acceptance of the functions of the comprehensive junior or community college.

Another report concerned with the question of faculty agreement toward the philosophy of the junior college concurs with these findings. Evans (1970) notes that those instructors who had junior college experiences were in significantly greater agreement with the philosophy of that institution than were those who had no such experiences. No differences were found between faculty who had been junior college teachers immediately prior to their present job and those who had come from other sources, although there was a cumulative effect of previous junior college contact upon a faculty member's agreement with its philosophy. The greater the contact, the greater the agreement.

A smattering of dissertations also sheds light on community college personnel. Beasley (1971), for example, discusses attitudes toward the purposes and functions of California community colleges, noting that many proclaimed functions are not supported by faculty. And Gennarino (1971) compared instructors in occupational and so-called transfer programs, with no differences reported in terms of previous experiences, reasons for choosing to teach in a community college and,--contradictory to Beasley (1971)--, their agreement with the purposes of a community college.

Few people can afford to ignore collective bargaining as a pertinent issue in educational governance today. Even those institutions that were previously able to look the other way when discussions arose about unionism can no longer hide from contemporary pressures. In a chapter in the first issue of New Directions for Community Colleges (1973) Howe writes about the myths and mysteries that threaten faculty in collective bargaining practices. He says that while collective bargaining "is a break with tradition...[it] is here to stay and must be accepted with confidence--and without myth,

mystery, or fear--because it can be productive. It must be embraced by those who receive but do not wish it, and those who advance it must help it bloom. Failing this, bargaining can be destructive" (p. 86). In a similar vein, Anderson (1971) points out that the attitudes of faculty members toward collective negotiations and "toward the various sanctions that could be applied within the collective negotiations framework--such as strikes--is important to our knowledge of how a community college functions" (p. 4).

An analysis of data collected from a questionnaire administered to 951 full-time faculty members in ten Pennsylvania community colleges suggests that a majority are favorably disposed to both faculty organization and collective negotiation, (Moore, 1970). Within faculty ranks, some discussion exists "concerning the desirability of various coercive tactics. Certain forms of sanctions generally are viewed as ethical actions to be used by faculty in the face of an impasse. However, there is considerable disagreement concerning the appropriateness of work stoppages as a collective tactic" (p. 40). Those instructors who expressed positive attitudes to collective bargaining looked upon themselves as relatively mobile. Interestingly, they demonstrated a drive toward increased faculty power since they actually indicated a "low sense of power," and felt themselves "relatively incapable of influencing the course of events within their college" (p. 42).

Kennelly's (1972) review of collective bargaining in higher education across the United States compares a number of different institutions in terms of extent of faculty collective bargaining, trends in collective negotiations, and collective bargaining as a locus of decision-making in academic governance. Three conceptual models of collective bargaining are presented, and findings

from the survey of 273 faculty members in 191 institutions suggest that while only 29% of the respondent institutions report collective bargaining activity, the greatest incidence of this occurrence is in community colleges. Fifty percent of the community colleges, compared with 24% of the universities, report bargaining activity where fringe benefits, salary, and due process are the most frequently negotiated issues.

It is difficult, of course, to establish clear-cut categorizations of either people or issues. This section has discussed some studies of community college faculty members in terms of somewhat overlapping areas--demographic and personality traits, institutional purposes and governance, and collective bargaining. While these reports are useful, none emphasizes either the similarities or differences in both people and issues across different schools of the same type. Part two attempts to do just that, to draw a comparative picture of a small sample (238) of instructors in three community colleges, focusing on diversity and homogeneity among people who function in colleges that are basically different in certain respects and much alike in others.

THE COLLEGES and the PEOPLE

Nothing remains constant. Whereas only a few years ago, studies of junior college faculties were practically nonexistent, and whereas faculties are usually examined together with their counterparts in four-year colleges and universities, there now are exceptions to mass data compilations. Indeed, we now know quite a bit about those people who teach in today's two-year colleges.

Some projects survey a large number of individuals; others look at a

smaller population but do so in greater depth. Studies of faculties in single schools and studies that look at instructors in a number of institutions provide base lines from which to ask further questions, just as do investigation comparing respondents from various types of institutions--two-year colleges, four-year liberal arts colleges, and multi universities. The singular studies tend to be, by definition, parochial, although they often provide insight into a college's staff that is not otherwise available. And the multi-institutional investigations, while usually employing better methodology and stimulating a greater amount of data, lump faculties together, a procedure that tends to neutralize their findings. If, for example, a small number of instructors are under 25 years and an equally small number are in the 60-65 age range, the mean range may be 40 but this hardly tells us much about the extremes who may be small in number but unique in that they possess special distinguishing characteristics. Similarly, by clustering all humanities or science teachers together, we may eliminate the special idiosyncrasies of the humanities or science instructors in one type of college who are all at a particular age level.

This caveat may or may not be important for all issues dealing with faculties in higher education. It does become important, however, when we attempt to tie certain information about a faculty to the types of programs that may best enhance their development. Several questions follow: Do faculties from a special type of institution tend to be alike on certain designated traits? Do all faculty members adhere to the same instructional approaches? Is one type of pre- or in-service program appropriate for all faculty? Can special procedures be designed to stimulate change and thus enhance faculty development in a particular type of institution, or must

special programs be developed for special types of instructors? If we understand both differences and similarities among these populations, can we design better preparation sequences for them? Can we alter their work experiences so that their own characteristics will be highlighted? Are distinct types of work expectations related to personality types? Some of these questions can be answered now. While others, presently uncertain, pose directions for future studies several assumptions may now be made:

1. If we are to follow through the ideas that undergird notions of faculty development--psychological, social, professional--we must know about many characteristics of these same individuals.

2. Faculty must be viewed both inter- and intra-institutionally.

3. Although generalizations always carry some risk, it is assumed that faculty in certain types of institutions are much like those in similar institutions in different locations. Thus, people who are employed at urban or rural or suburban institutions may hold several things in common with their counterparts at other such schools.

One purpose of the study reported here is to inquire into the diversity of faculty members in three different types of institutions. We assume that the majority of variables assessed will tend to show that faculty are more alike than different but that differences do exist. If we find that differences are greater than similarities among the instructors of the three colleges, then it follows that in-service programs must be individually tailored. On the other hand, if there is a preponderance of similarity or homogeneity among the faculty members in the seemingly different schools, then the same models or programs to increase faculty development may well apply to what we see as apparently different types of institutions.

The project with which we are concerned in this section looks at faculty members of three community colleges in terms of demographic characteristics, values, and emphases on college programs. Its overriding purpose was to develop guidelines for institutional assessment that would consider the specific characteristics of junior colleges, student bodies, faculties, and administrative staffs. The three schools ("Urban," "Suburban," and "Rural") from which the subjects were drawn are all located within a 75 mile radius of Los Angeles. The main difference between the data presented here and that provided by other studies is not in types of variables but rather, is that institutions purporting to serve many similar purposes are compared in terms of their faculty members.

No one institution can ever completely duplicate another. There is some evidence, however, that colleges manifest the characteristics of their regions (Munday, 1969). These schools are perceived like other junior colleges throughout the country. Accordingly, their particular characteristics may be of interest to others who see in them certain similarities to their own institutions.

URBAN COLLEGE.* Established in 1927, this is a large community college in an urban/industrial area of some 250,000 people. Its district covers an area of a little under 30 square miles, with six feeder high schools. Like many other inner-city schools, it has weathered a number of changes, more or less successfully, not the least of which has been a changed ethnic composition that reflects a changing community. It has a total faculty of 186, 97 of whom

* I am very much indebted to John Lombardi of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges who provided much of the material presented here about the colleges.

are part-time. The total student population was (in 1969) 2,700, 1,600 full-time and 1,100 part-time.

At one time, Urban College was a "rah-rah" school that boasted a nationally recognized football team. With pride in the number of its graduates who went on to four-year colleges and universities, it was respected by its supporting community; as an institution that represented primarily a white, middle-class population, it acted as an agent of upward mobility. "Going to college" meant a step up the ladder for many of its students and, less directly but perhaps as important, for their parents.

Along with its supporting community, Urban College has undergone several changes during the years. The decline of its dominance in athletics coincided with the change in ethnic composition of its community and student body. The white businessmen who financially supported the athletic program left this urban community and were replaced by others who showed less interest in the teams. The student population has also seen a shift in numbers. Now, at a time when postsecondary schooling has become more the expected than the unique, when enrollments in most institutions of higher learning have markedly increased from the 1920's, Urban College has few students in relation to its district population. Because of these lowered enrollment figures, few new faculty members have been employed in recent years and those instructors who have been at Urban College for a decade or more have seen the character of their school change markedly. The student population has moved from primarily white to a mixed composition of approximately 39% white, 49% black, 8% Spanish surname, and 4% Oriental. Whereas in the 1930's a considerable number of students transferred to universities from this community college, only about 340 now obtain an A.A. degree annually and fewer than 500 go on to further schooling,

at least immediately after securing the associate degree or obtaining sufficient credits to transfer. Pride in the football team, in the school publications, and in other such activities, has dissipated.

SUBURBAN COLLEGE. In many ways, this is the antithesis of the inner city school. The junior member of a two-campus, 76 mile district located in a coastal region, it serves an area of 361,000 people, approximately fifty miles south of central Los Angeles. Eight high schools feed into this school which employs 128 faculty members, only 6 of whom are part-time and which had, in 1969, 3,434 students, 2,027 full-time.

The area surrounding Suburban College is composed of predominantly white, conservative, moddle and upper-middle class families. Walled tracts of modest homes for lower-class families, however, are scattered throughout the area and the approximately 10% Spanish surname people (mainly Mexican Americans) who live in the college's service area are spread out among several barrios or enclaves. Both the service area and the district are predominantly bedroom communities in that the majority of residents commute to work in other areas. Manufacturing, construction, oil production, communication, and financial and distributive service enterprises largely define the district's economy.

Perhaps more than most community colleges, this campus has a certain amount of latitude to develop an educational program for the needs of its students and the community it serves. Because of limited facilities, it concentrated in its early years on courses and curriculums that did not require extensive and expensive facilities and equipment, and it encouraged its instructors to design their own equipment. Originally, in fact, a number of Suburban College's faculty were recruited from the district's older college just because

they wanted to "innovate." Now, its newest audiotutorial designs are sources of pride to faculty and administrative staffs, as are the carrels and creative laboratory setups that have been an integral part of this system. The technical media are used by students as essential components of their courses and of the curriculum as a whole, not merely as adjuncts to courses or programs as, unfortunately, is so often the case when other schools embark on a program of advanced multimedia instruction.

Yet, in spite of the emphasis on a variety of media, it is the attitudes of many people at this college that are particularly refreshing. In fact, one would probably be quite accurate in concluding that it is not merely the innovative equipment but the people who run the school that define its uniqueness. A contagious spirit still exists, an eagerness and desire to create something new and effective which, despite all the esprit of advocates of innovation in other institutions, is all too rare.

Seventy-five percent of Suburban College's students typically indicate a transfer goal, whereas only about 25 percent actually transfer, five percent become occupational majors, and 70 percent are neither transfer nor occupational. This emphasis on transfer, a prevailing characteristic of junior college students who enroll in higher education for the first time, concerns the college staff just as it concerns staffs of most junior colleges across the nation. Explanations counting for the phenomenon, with so little reality in fact, are numerous, the most popular being the upward mobility American tradition. When offered a choice, students almost naturally select what they deem to be the most desirable of options and the transfer curriculum appears almost universally to have the most appeal.

This picture of transfer selection that seems to mirror other institutions throughout the country is matched by a view of attrition that also parallels many other schools. In the Spring, 1969 semester, for example, 37 percent of all students failed to complete classes in which they had registered. In this sense, attrition notes appear similar to those of other community colleges on a national basis; however, a different situation actually exists regarding mobility patterns. Indeed, one of the greatest differences between this particular institution and other colleges is that it does not seem to be an agent of upward mobility for its community. Whereas many students in our other two subject colleges--as, indeed, in community colleges throughout America--are the first in their families to attend college, suburban students frequently have parents who themselves hold college degrees. Accordingly, this institution performs a function that is different from that of many other community colleges; rather than serving as a bridge toward upper mobility, it maintains the status quo by enrolling students who often do not care about further schooling but who enroll in higher education because of parental expectation.

RURAL COLLEGE. Notably different from the other two institutions in our study, this two-year college is in a rural community that covers 2,500 square miles but numbers only 60,000 people. Fairly new, its relatively few students are typically drawn from four feeder high schools. Whereas we have seen that Urban College is potentially an agent of upward mobility and Suburban College acts as a control mitigating downward mobility, this school functions more as a traditional self-contained institution in a rather isolated area. Approximately 40 percent of its students (in 1969, 1,308; 465

full-time and 843 part-time) continue their education in four-year colleges and universities and since few of their parents had themselves had college experiences, this institution acts as a springboard for socioeconomic movement upward and out, away from the home town. This in many ways it represents one phase of democracy's dream. It has 65 faculty members, 37 full-time and 28 part-time.

The communities served by Rural College are small; contain a disproportionate retired population, many of whom are on fixed incomes; have relatively few middle-aged families with children of high school and college age; and have not yet been affected by suburbanization. The college was launched in 1962 and in the fall of 1969 it was the largest of the state's small colleges. The ethnic composition of the student body is 90 percent white, six percent Spanish surname, three percent black, 0.5 percent American Indian, and 0.5 percent Oriental. The administration is troubled by this disparity between the district population and the distribution of ethnicity among the student body and also by the fact, typical in California colleges, that students from minority groups do not enroll in a trades apprenticeship program.

Rural College's administration has concentrated on and vastly supported the development of multimedia instructional programs. It has adopted the concept of defined outcomes in which instructional objectives are stated in terms of expected student operational ability at course completion (Cohen, 1969); has developed a Tutorial Instruction Center containing instructional materials and audiovisual equipment needed by the student, with a credentialed person available for individual consultation; and the college president has developed materials, professionally produced by a commercial artist and a sound technician, for sale to other colleges. In both quantity and quality, Rural College

ranks among the best in the state in terms of equipment and materials.

Small group sessions, individual sessions, and general assemblies form the elements in the multimedia instructional program. Emphasis here is on the individual who progresses at the rate best suited to him. At the same time, enrollment patterns follow that of most junior/community colleges, with 76 percent of the students classified as freshmen and 24 percent as sophomores. This pattern appears true of both full-time and part-time students. In the fall of 1969, the total enrollment was 1,343, of which 809 were day and 538 evening students. In 1969, the graduating class numbered 106.

Perhaps the way a school reflects other seemingly similar institutions is more important than the extent to which it is examined. One institution may not be exactly like another but certain things prevail that are expected to show reliability over time. It is therefore assumed that any urban college has much to say to other inner-city institutions, that small rural colleges represent others of their ilk, and that those suburban institutions that are inundated by an influx of people into their feeder-area strikingly resemble other institutions bordering large cities in America.

Certainly there are other ways of comparing institutions. Measures of confrontation, generation differences and activism served as methods of analysis for a period of time following the Berkeley incidents of the mid-1960s. During less hectic times, curricular comparisons, associated activities, and enrollment figures provide different kinds of insight into a school's operations. If higher educational institutions are to be assessed on the basis of their effectiveness, however, the ultimate measure must be defined according to their impact on their constituents--specifically, how students have developed both cognitively and affectively. And if, as Cohen (1969) maintains,

teaching is teaching only if it is directly tied to learning, then it is possible to evaluate an institution on the basis of its students achievement along previously defined outcomes. In any case, a school is defined by its personnel--and examination of faculty presents a way of understanding one segment of this critical population. The project reported in part here was conducted to this end.

The Staff. Several formats have been adapted as a way of examining instructors: pigeonholing them according to various typologies, gathering demographic and social data about such items as schools attended or affiliated disciplines isolating idiosyncratic traits that may possibly relate to one or another variable that some investigator deems important. The approach reported here is broader than some, narrower than others.

All data reported here were obtained from a Staff Survey that had been administered in group form to the faculty and administrative staffs at each of the three subject colleges. From their responses to this instrument, the subjects are described in terms of selected demographic variables; college affiliation; and values, as obtained from Rokeach's (1968) Instrumental and Terminal Values Scales. Some information is available for 238 subjects but, since every person did not respond to every item, there is some variation. Regardless of the actual number, however, several questions prevail: What about diversity among the faculty at the three schools? If it seems desirable that there be varied types of instructors to parallel varied types of students, as some people maintain, does the community college actually provide different types of instructors to serve as different role models for its students? Does one school have a preponderant number of faculty who may be

distinguished by any special characteristics?

According to Martin's (1969) report on 577 faculty from eight apparently diverse schools, crosscuts on data, "whether by age categories, publications, academic specializations, teaching load; whether old or new schools, conventional or innovative, show that faculty are more alike than dissimilar in their attitudes toward educational assumptions, values, and goals; the criteria for institutional excellence; and the prospects for professional or institutional change...on item after item there were no statistically significant differences among faculty while comparative data analyses made clear their overwhelming degree of like-mindedness. Differences that appear were often a matter of degree" (pp. 206-207).

If Martin's information discloses such homogeneity among faculties in schools that had been selected initially because of their apparent diversity, can we expect diversity among a smaller number of instructors in only three schools, all designated as comprehensive community colleges? Responses to certain actuarial items in the staff survey are presented here not so much to validate or refute Martin's point but to approach some understanding of the instructors in light of the expectations they face from students, administrators, the public at large and finally, themselves.

A vast number of studies characterize faculty in terms of their academic degrees and the institutions from which these degrees were earned. For comparative purposes, then, we offer this information: Sixty-five respondents to the staff survey reported holding the A.A., suggesting that about 27 percent of the total surveyed had attended a junior college. In addition, 221 held Bachelor's degrees, 184 held the Master's, and 36 designated "Other."

When it came to a breakdown in schools, Urban College had 22 faculty and staff members holding the A.A. degree, 76 the Bachelor's, 60 the Master's, and 7 designating "Other". Suburban College's staff held a total of 36 Associate degrees, 113 Bachelor's, 95 Master's and 10, "Other". The notably smaller sized staff in the Rural College reported that seven instructors had attained the A.A. degree, 32 the Bachelor's, 29 the Master's, and 7, "Other". Most degrees were obtained in either the public four-year college or university, although some faculty designated denominational schools, private colleges, or teacher's colleges as their degree-granting institutions. More interesting than a mere count of degrees held might be a tabulation--five or ten years hence--to see how many young instructors recently joining the faculties in these schools have since earned the doctorate. In some places a trend is now appearing toward the earned doctorate--the Ph.D., Ed.D., and, occasionally, the Doctor of Arts in Teaching (see Fader, 1971). Whether this tendency continues might have import for the future, especially in terms of salary increments.

Although some clustering appears along certain dimensions, this homogeneity is too sporadic and is counteracted by sufficient diversity to establish that the faculties in the three schools are much the same. Indeed, enough variability pertains along demographic dimensions to suggest that these 238 people apparently reveal interesting differences to their students. At the same time, whatever differences do occur, tend to be limited and I therefore assume that the faculty is similar on most demographic items no matter how accurate, sketchy, or superficial they may be. And I assume further that those differences that exist in cognitive, connotative, and

affective areas are specific to the individual and do not distinguish faculty in one college from faculty in the other two colleges examined in our Project. Some of the more interesting findings will be noted here--for example, half the faculty respondents favor the lecture method despite the fact that two of the colleges considered themselves to be innovative.

A real departure is evident in terms of the grading system desired by most. Some type of pass/fail system was indicated as most desirable by most teachers surveyed but even here, 97 of the 238 respondents still prefer the "security" of the letter grade.

When it comes to what they think students want in teaching most faculty members indicated they felt that students would like "interesting lectures." Interestingly, as Cohen reported (1970), while all three faculties ranked "specific learning objectives" last or next to last, entering freshmen who responded to a similar instrument ranked this same item first. "Further, when each instructor was asked what he thought his students would like him to do, 'Specify learning objectives for them' was marked by two-thirds of the group." Thus, a majority of instructors felt their students would like objectives specified for them. At the same time, they thought objectives were the last things students cared for (p. 58). It is always difficult for one person to get into the mind of another but the contradiction here is especially noteworthy.

Other differences between students and staffs, which in some cases point to a strong argument for irreconcilability between the groups, have been explored in a study of student/staff values (Brawer, 1971). Using Rokeach's (1968) Instrumental and Terminal Values Scales, to which the subjects

responded by rank-ordering 18 items each, the populations were divided according to such variables as role (student or teacher) age, sex, and teaching or major field.

In terms of the composite population (all students versus all faculty) rating the Terminal Values, only 5 of the 18 possibilities were assigned the same order by each group. In terms of age groups, differences were insignificant for the Terminal Values and even less so for the Instrumental Values, although these differences became more apparent when the staffs and student values were combined. Again with sex, similarity between groups was generally greater than differences. "Accordingly, we might hypothesize that the role assumed by the faculty is actually greater than any differences that might appear in terms of his or her sex--that is, when an individual decides to adopt the teaching role, he generally becomes more like other teachers, regardless of sex" (Brawer, 1971, pp. 38-39).

Other information about these instructors at the three California community colleges includes the problems they report in their professional roles, three items here showing significant differences. The Rural College faculty rated "Lack of time for scholarly study" and "Understanding college policies to be followed in curriculum development and revision" as more important than the faculties of the other two schools. Again here we note that faculty tend to be more alike than different in their reactions to our survey questions, and wonder whether such homogeneity is a "goal" for the community college. The greater number of faculty in all three schools feel that they should have the major responsibility for educational policy but they also feel it is the administrative staff who must mandate personnel policy. This

appears fairly consistent with some of the findings reported earlier from faculties at various other schools.

Another item in the Faculty Survey invited respondents to indicate up to five reasons why they thought students attended their college. Responses were rank ordered in terms of frequency. In this case, a wider spread was evident among the schools, even though similar rankings were obtained for "Get training for a job" and differences no greater than one point for "Parents want them to," "To apply for a student draft deferment," "Get a basic general education and appreciation of ideas," and "Be with friends". Agreement is indicated in only 5 of 15 items, suggesting a greater disparity in the way faculty adjudge students' feelings and attitudes. This appears consistent with findings referred to earlier, as reported by Cohen (1970).

When it comes to goals for their students, faculties in the three colleges showed extreme consistency. There was greater discrepancy among respondents from the three schools, however, in terms of what they felt a junior college should help students acquire (Knowledge and skills directly applicable to their careers; An understanding and mastery of some specialized body of knowledge; Preparation for further formal education; Self knowledge and personal identity; A broad general education; Knowledge of and interest in community and world problems.) Faculty respondents were genuinely concerned with their students' learning and their own effects upon students, wishing that they had more data on their long-term effects on students, that students were more inclined to study, and that they had some assurances their students were learning.

In terms of types of instructional patterns preferred by instructors

in the three colleges, it appears that faculties in the three colleges differ particularly regarding preferences toward structures and unstructured class discussions, audio-tutorial sessions and pass/no credit and ABC no credit grading practices. They are more similar in the ways they see themselves in comparison with the "average junior college teacher." (Commitment to students, understanding and accepting the junior college philosophy, knowledge of both subject matter and institutional practices, and tendencies to alter instruction where appropriate.)

This, then is the way the faculties of three California community colleges stack up along certain selected characteristics. There are some differences among our three subgroups but in general, each school seems to have instructors much like instructors in the two other comparative institutions. The question of intra-institutional heterogeneity is not answered but inter-institutional differences do seem to be rather minimal.

WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

Interestingly, while we find that faculty in our three subject colleges are much the same in terms of selected characteristics, differences in several areas have been indicated for student populations at these same institutions. These have been reported more fully elsewhere (Brawer, 1973). For our purposes, here, a succinct summary of major differences (statistically significant at the .05 level or greater) were noted among students in terms of the following variables: number of children (fewer suburban than urban or rural students are married; hours spent working outside of school (more urban students do not work at all); number of schools attended (urban students

are the least mobile of the three populations); ethnic background (no racial balance in our schools); and number of books in the home (fewer books in the homes of urban students).

It is difficult to make a definitive pronouncement regarding diversity/conformity in the populations of these schools because such a statement must hinge upon those criteria that are specifically used to define the variables under consideration. However, we can say that diversity is greater among students than among faculty. It may well be that, as noted previously, once a person assumes the role of a faculty member he is more like his colleagues than he is like students, even when such characteristics as age, sex, and area of interest are controlled. At the same time, diversity along a measure of student development, which has been defined as Functional Potential (Brawer, 1973) and which is believed to represent a basic and permeable trait, is less marked in terms of actuarial items.

If differences are minor among the three school faculties but rather larger when it comes to comparing different types of institutions (e.g., four and two-year colleges), what does this mean insofar as prior educational preparation, selection, and in-service training are concerned? What effect--if any--does it have on the personal and professional development of faculty members? Do varying forces impinging on the faculty have varying effects on them? Conclusions here are discussed from the standpoint of previously cited studies as well as data directly from our project in terms of faculty satisfaction, institutional environment and effectiveness and faculty development.

Satisfaction. A case has been made for helping faculty establish a professional stance that would both stem from and enhance their own sense of

identity (Cohen and Brawer, 1972). The quest for professionalism continues to be a worthy endeavor. In planning sequences for such development, it is important to know the kinds of people with whom we deal, and information available from those studies cited in this paper, as well as more limited material indigenous to single institutions, lead us towards such understanding. Yet, there is much more that needs to be known. For example, the whole area of job satisfaction is hardly discussed in any major investigations and while Eckert and Williams (1972) do consider some elements of this broader area, a considerable amount of information is lacking.

Fortunately, Frankel (1973) makes a notable beginning at such understanding when she writes that job satisfaction is "important not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it has been held that the worker who likes his job will work with efficiency and enthusiasm--the dissatisfied one will show the opposite effect. As educators try to upgrade the educational environment, they should apply this idea to teachers, theorizing that those who find satisfaction in their jobs will create a better learning environment for students than those who do not" (1973, p. 1). Toward this end, she summarizes various theoretical frameworks of work satisfaction, describes the junior/community college as a work environment and discusses expressions of job satisfaction and dissatisfactions among two-year college faculty. Indicators of job satisfaction are cited, Eckert's studies (with Stecklein, 1961 and with Williams, 1972) as well as Kurth and Mills' (1958) report that 95% of the faculty they surveyed suggested they were happy with teaching as a career. This finding later presents a decided difference from the 25% who expressed satisfaction in Medsker's (1960) report and the 31% who so indicated

satisfaction in the earlier Eckert and Stecklein (1959) study. Also along this same line, Garrison (1967) points to the "genuine enthusiasm" with which community college faculty meet their teaching responsibilities.

A multi-authored report of a special task force, chaired by O'Toole and culminating in the important Work in America (1973), addresses itself to the whole area of occupational satisfaction. While this document does not mention the community college specifically and, indeed, hardly refers to education at any level, it does focus on the quality of work life in America. A picture is drawn here of a rather pervasive lack of commitment to work tasks, feelings of anomie and alienation, physical and mental health problems and family instability, conditions in which "Many workers at all occupational levels feel locked-in, their mobility blocked, the opportunity to grow lacking in their jobs, challenge missing from their tasks" (p. xvi). At the same time, the authors point out that "work can be redesigned to make it more satisfying" and that "workers can be healthier, happier in their work, and better contributors to family and community life than they are now" (p. 94). Several issues are discussed to this end (occupation and status, job content, supervision, peer relationships, wages, mobility, working conditions and job security) and certain features from commercial enterprises may be incorporated in educational institutions. These include autonomous work groups (self-management work teams), integrated support functions, challenging job assignments, job mobility and rewards for learning, facilitative leadership (creating a team leader position to facilitate team development and decision-making) and the dissemination of managerial decision information, and self-governance (pp. 96-97).

Directing itself now to teachers and the educational enterprise, the O'Toole report suggests that "the process by which education may be made more satisfying is suggested by the criticisms of the contemporary work place; we would expect the school to become more satisfying as a place of work,...by removing the equivalent necessity of punching a time-clock, by increasing the autonomy of the worker, by enlarging tasks and by reducing rigidities. If students were viewed as workers and teachers as team leaders, school work places might be redesigned along the lines of other work places..., with a high degree of participation among all the workers and team leaders in the choice of procedures to reach the goals" (pp. 142-143). These are ways in which faculty may react to demanding external forces.

Redesigning the school as a work place should include consideration of issues raised by Purdy (1973), who stresses the need for autonomy, and by Garrison (1967) and Siehr (1963), who both point to community college faculty's laments about inadequate time for scholarly study. A comparison with our own data would be of further interest. Problems associated with salaries and fringe benefits have led to universal interest in collective bargaining (see Howe, 1973, and Blackburn and Bylsma, 1970), and these too must be examined when faculty and student development concern college planners. Although it is difficult to pinpoint either satisfaction or dissatisfaction as resulting from one or two desirable or undesirable conditions, it does seem important to examine faculty in terms of their particular institution and the various ways in which they function therein. Even though we find several characteristics held in common by the majority of instructors in a school, we may still find a range of differences in terms of their behavior and the effects they have on their students.

Institutional Environment and Effectiveness. This brings us to two special areas, the institutional environment and the measures of effectiveness generated by an institution. Our three college faculty data provide no information per se on the types of institutional environments that actually exist. It may well be that, as Lombardi (1971) expresses, "Tell me it's a junior college and I'll tell you many things about it." Yet, there are differences in campuses not only in terms of geographical location (e.g., urban, suburban and rural) but in other characteristics that may apply to academic environments. If faculty are pretty much the same across schools, for example, then perhaps it would be helpful to look at administrator styles of governing patterns.

Development. What kinds of institutions and what types of instructors most facilitate student development? Are there consistent patterns that can be instituted to facilitate development? While we still do not have answers to these specific kinds of questions, some of the people at the Wright Institute at Berkeley are addressing themselves to faculty development as a cue to better education. Sanford (1971), for example, noting that "The ultimate aim of our studies...is the improvement of teaching" (p. 357) discusses a project in which 300 college professors in eight different institutions were interviewed. Basic to the development of faculty toward a more fulfilling posture is the student. Yet, as Sanford writes, "with no terms for describing student development, without even a perspective from which the student can be seen as a person, the teacher of undergraduates is denied the most elementary satisfaction of professional activity--seeing desirable things happen as a direct result of planned action. Worst of all, academic culture, while

perhaps helping to ensure that most faculty members meet minimum standards as teachers, has features which stand in the way of the teacher's development, upon which...the development of students heavily depends" (p. 360).

Sanford goes on to note that the more the individual instructor is aware of himself, the more he can see students as people. The more he is attuned to his own feelings, the more he is able to appreciate similar feelings in his students, and the more conscious he is of his own classroom behavior, the more likely he is to evaluate his own work. This thesis is similar to the one advanced by Cohen and Brawer (1972), who state that

> Clear-cut conceptualization of purpose reflects maturity in both institution and profession. The willingness to be judged by one's effects is a primary factor in personal and professional integration. It also reflects maturity by suggesting both autonomous functioning and value congruence between the individual and his environment... [If] the instructor [is] to function as an independent, mature individual, he must face himself honestly and be very much aware of what he is trying to do...this self-awareness is a major indicator of an integrated being who is at home with himself and certain of his identity (p. 221).
>
> [The flexible person who is] certain of his identity, fully professional in his work orientation, able to search persistently into himself for greater consciousness of all his processes of being, is the person who manifests a high degree of ego strength. The good teacher is the good person. Indeed, the mature instructor who would enhance institutional and professional maturity must be a decent sort

of individual. Beyond that, however, the mature, conscious professional must know well what he is about and accept himself as a many-faceted, ever-developing human being (Cohen and Brawer, 1972, p. 222).

Sanford sees the process of self-study of both individual and institution as the agency of change. He suggests that this type of procedure "is based on the assumption that professors are human, that they have needs and aspirations that are not fulfilled under present arrangements but which, when they have been brought fully into awareness, can be fulfilled--without loss to other values--under different [institutional] arrangements" (Sanford, 1971, p. 368). This process of change can make higher educational institutions more human, allowing their personnel to feel less alienation and less at the mercy of the impersonality of their surroundings.

Although faculty are often reviewed in terms of personal and professional development, the term "faculty development" has different meanings for different people. In many instances, it implies in-service training, specialized workshops, or certain types of reward systems. Assuming a consensus regarding the advisability of pushing such an issue, it is still uncertain whether one type of package will fit all faculty members in all schools. Are community college instructors sufficiently alike that one model will really represent all? Do faculty members in particular types of colleges cluster along certain dimensions? It seems they often do, and if the general pattern tends toward homogeneity, then we can talk about single packages that will pertain to all faculty with the hope that institutional change eventually will be effected. On the other hand, if there are sufficient differences among faculty subgroups (personality type, gender, type of school, subject

area or discipline), as we have also seen, then we must recognize the need for a variety of programs rather than one pervasive type. Thus, the faculty from one school might more happily be subjected to one kind of in-service program while those from another school should be treated to a different program. Or instructors coming from one discipline may well react more favorably to a program designed in view of their major field.

In education, as in other segments of society, we live with fads and gimmicks in a kind of ebb and flow phenomenon. Some styles of the past tend to crop up in modified versions every few years, much the same as clothes styles have a way of appearing, disappearing, and then reappearing. Other points of emphases tend to become so engrained in the rubric of our everyday lives that we take them for granted--for example, notions of individual differences and, in California and many other states now, the open door policy for community colleges. In the past few years, we have seen a change from the meritocratic approach to higher education to one of egalitarianism. Almost concurrently, another shift is seen in the emphasis away from students' abilities (or lack of) to a focus on teacher accountability. Whereas it used to be that if students failed to learn, the student was assumed to be at fault, teachers are now being held responsible for their students' achievements.

Another change has taken place in terms of the construct of development. Until fairly recently, development was considered in terms of psychosexual or psychosocial stages (Freud, 1953; Erickson, 1963). Kohlberg's (1958) and Werner's (1948) emphasis on the cognitive and conceptual domain, modifications of Erikson's scheme by Constantinople (1969) and Loevinger and Wessler (1970) all conceive of development as a hierarchical process that does not go

beyond adulthood. Thus, when development has been generally discussed in terms of education, the time constriction limited it to students only and typically, students entering college. The notion of development within the college years has been advanced by Sanford (1962, 1967) and several people have followed his lead in describing personality changes occurring with post-secondary experiences (Freedman, 1967; Chickering, 1971; Heath, 1958).

Indeed, development is not something that must cease when a person reaches his majority. As a matter of fact, Goldstein's (1939) and Maslow's (1954) concept of self-actualization almost exactly designates development in the later years, and Jung's (1953) individuation process rarely occurs before that period which he designates as the middle half of life phase. There is a flexibility in these approaches that does not apply to earlier hierarchial theories. Levinson at Yale (personal communication, 1973) and Gould at UCLA's Neuropsychiatric Institute (Holbrook, 1973) talk about critical adult stages. And, as we have already indicated, Cohen and Brawer (1972) discuss professionalism in terms of the person's sense of identity. People at the Wright Institute focus on individual awareness or consciousness-raising as a way of improving college and university teaching. Freedman (1973) points to faculty development as a "heightening of self-awareness, an increase of autonomy, and a broadening of perspective on the world. My concern is that faculty better understand themselves and their social and organizational situation, and my hope is that such knowledge will make them better teachers, better researchers, better educators generally" (p. ix).

Thus, although the concept of development most typically is discussed in terms of people who are moving toward maturity or, in higher education,

to students who are achieving some type of growth, it also can be considered in terms of faculty progression. In fact, with the recent focus on personal growth, there is concomitantly a heightened awareness of faculty development, whether this be approached from the standpoint of Sanford (1971), Sanford and Freedman (1973) or Cohen and Brawer (1972), or whether it be seen in a less psychological sense. The first issues of New Directions for Community Colleges (Cohen, 1973) and New Directions for Higher Education (Freedman, 1973) provide a good baseline of information on various institutional programs. These range from institutes directed to people from several community colleges, as conducted by the Danforth Foundation (Schwilck and Martin, 1973) to intra-school programs, such as those operating at Miami-Dade Junior College-North Campus (Zion and Sutton, 1973), Hampshire College or Ottawa University (Gerth, 1973) or Findlay College (Noonan, 1973). Although these programs, and the models upon which they are based, vary in format, all are geared toward faculty change as a necessary step to more effective teaching. Toward a similar end are the many in-service and orientation sessions that prevail on college campuses throughout the country. The brief, "Community College Faculty Development", prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges 1973 Assembly, describes preparatory sequences for community college teachers, specialized pre- and in-service training programs, and programs dealing with the disadvantaged or "new" students and their specific problems. A selected annotated bibliography, drawn from the files of ERIC's Research in Education and other sources, is important to this brief. Here faculty development is viewed from several perspectives, all of which play a part in describing the

person who teaches in the contemporary community college.

In Summary. If we are to continue to emphasize the importance of faculty development...and to view development in terms of personal growth or change...then we must know something about the subjects with whom we are concerned. Many attempts have been made to examine teaching staffs along a variety of measures. Earlier studies tended to focus either on individual personalities (Mark Hopkins of Williams, Henry P. Tappan and James B. Angell of Michigan, Charles W. Eliot of Harvard), on demographic compendia or on general traits that distinguished the outstanding or "good" teacher. Reports dealing specifically with junior/community college teachers that are not indigenous to one school (as so many of them are) are still few in number (Hendrix, 1964 and Garrison, 1967; Brawer, 1968; Cohen and Associates, 1971).

Whatever the emphasis, however, a better understanding of faculty as a mature body of professionals and a better understanding of the goals of community college education cannot help but enhance the development of both individual and institution. Studies have been cited here that compare two-year college faculties with their colleagues at other institutions of higher education and data have been reported from an inter-institutional study of three supposedly diverse schools. Our findings suggest that while faculty members are fairly similar across the schools, differences do exist intra-institutionally. Thus, it would seem most advisable to prepare programs and emphasize institutional processes that address the faculty as developing human beings. These processes would vary but they would all be geared toward an increase in autonomy, a broadening of the sense of "work space", as Purdy (1973) denotes the term, and a decided realization of the effects of certain

actions on human functioning. We have ideas as to ways to proceed but no definitive notion of one superior approach. Indeed, it is most probably that there is no one way but that several processes must be employed to bring college faculties and institutions together on bases that are more satisfying for both. The community college cannot afford to ignore these issues if it is to enhance its own development and the development of its constituents. If it persists in such ignorance, external agencies will be forced to correct them in ways they may resent and which, indeed, will be unfortunate for most people concerned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Junior Colleges. To Work in a Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966. (ED 032 886)

Anderson, G. Pennsylvania Community College Faculty. Center for the Study of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1971.

Barrett, C. Relationship Between Perceived Faculty Participation in the Decision Making Process and Job Satisfaction in the Community Colleges of North Carolina, Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1969. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms. Order No. 7G 9173.

Bayer, A. E. "College and University Faculty: A Statistical Description." ACE Research Reports. 5(5): June 1970.

Bayer, A. E. "Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73." ACE Research Reports. 8(2): August 1973.

Beasley, W. "Faculty Attitudes Toward the California Commun[illegible]ege." Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern Califor[illegible], 1971. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. (order no. 72-11, 903.)

Blackburn R. and Bylsma D. "Changes in Organizational Structure and in Locus of Decision Making: A Test of Theory in Community Colleges Before and After Collective Negotiations." Unpublished paper, [1970.] (ED 057 791)

Blai, B. Values and Perceptions of a Private Junior College Faculty: Public Community College Faculties and Students. Bryn Mayr, Pennsylvania: Harcum Junior College, May 1972. (ED 061 945)

Brawer, F. B. Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph no. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, 1968. (ED 026 408)

Brawer, F. B. Values and the Generation Gap: Junior College Freshman and Faculty. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Monograph no. 11. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges. 1971.

Brawer, F. B. New Perspectives on Personality Development in College Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1973.

Bushnell, D. Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.

Bylsma, D. and Blackburn, R. T. "Changes in Faculty Governance and Faculty Welfare: Some Empirical Consequences of Collective Negotiations." 1971. (ED 058 882)

Chickering, A. W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cohen, A. M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, Calif: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Cohen, A. M. "Technology: Thee or Me? Behavioral Objectives and the College Teacher." Journal of Educational Technology, 1970, (10), 57-60.

Cohen, A. M. "Toward a Professional Faculty." New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 1(1), Spring 1973.

Cohen, A. M. "Work Satisfaction Among Junior College Faculty Members." Paper presented to the California Educational Research Association, November 28, 1973. (ED 081 426)

Cohen, A. M., and Associates. A Constant Variable. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. "Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College." Los Angeles: University of California Junior College Leadership Program, 1968. (ED 019 939)

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. Measuring Faculty Performance. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph no. 4, Washington, D.C. American Association for Junior Colleges, 1969. (ED 031 222)

Cohen, A. M., and Brawer, F. B. Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, 1972.

Constantinople, A. "An Ericksonian Measure of Personality Development in College Students." Developmental Psychology, 1969. 1(4).

Eckert, R. and Stecklein, J. "Career Motivations and Satisfactions of Junior College Teachers." Junior College Journal. 30:83-89; October 1959.

Eckert, R. and Stecklein, J. Job Motivations and Satisfactions of College Teachers. U.S. Office of Education, 1961.

Eckert, R. and Williams, H. Y. College Faculty View Themselves and Their Jobs. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1972.

Erickson, E. H. Childhood and Society. (2nd Ed.) New York: Norton, 1963.

Evans, A. "Faculty Agreement with the Community College Philosophy as Related to Previous Education and Experience in the Junior College. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms. (order no. 71-20, 802.)

Fader, D. "Shaping an English Curriculum to Fit Junior College Students." Junior College Research Review. V 5(10), June 1971. Los Angeles, University of California, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1971.

Frankel, J. "Junior College Faculty Job Satisfaction." ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Unpublished paper. Los Angeles, University of California, 1973. (ED 081 425)

Freedman, M. B. The College Experience. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Freedman, M., Ed. Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education. Vol. 1, (1), Spring 1973. Jossey-Bass.

Freedman, M. and Bloom, M. "Personal History and Professional Career." Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education. Vol. 1, (1), Spring 1973. Jossey-Bass.

Freud, S. Complete Psychological Works. Standard ed. Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1953.

Friedman, N. "The Public Junior College Teacher in Unified Public School System Junior Colleges: A Study in the Sociology of Educational Work." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, September 1965. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms. (65-9109)

Garrison, Roger. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. (ED 012 177)

Gelso, C. and Sims, D. "Perceptions of a Junior College Environment." Journal of College Student Personnel. 9:40-44, 1968.

Gennarino, E. "An Analysis of Need Structures and Attitudes Toward Teaching Among Full Time Community College Faculty Members." Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1971. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University microfilms. (order no. 71-25, 824.)

Gerth, D. R. "Institutional Approaches to Faculty Development," in Freedman, Mervin (Ed.) Facilitating Faculty Development: New Directions for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1973.

Gleazer, E. J. "Preparation of Junior College Teachers." Education Record 48. (1967):147-52. (ED 016 489)

Goldstein, K. The Organism. New York: American Book Co., 1939.

Hamill, R. E. "The Effects of Teachers in Four-Year Colleges and Universities as Reference Groups for Teachers in Community Colleges." Eugene, University of Oregon, School of Education, 1967. (ED 017 260)

Heath, S. R., Jr. Personality and Student Development: New Dimensions of Learning in a Free Society. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958.

Hendrix, V. L. "Relationship Between Personnel Policies and Faculty Life-Record Data in Public Junior Colleges." California Journal of Educational Research. 15(1964):150-60. (ED 015 747)

Holbrook, T. "The Times of our Lives." UCLA Monthly. Vol. 3, (5), March 1973.

Howe, R. "Myths and Mysteries of Collective Bargaining." New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1973.

Hunt, F. The Role of the Faculty in Organization Change in Junior Colleges Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1964, University Microfilms. (order no. 65-6304.)

Jencks, C. et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America. New York, New York: Basic Book, 1972.

Jung, C. G. Collected Works. Vol. 7, Two Essays on Analytical Psychology. New York: Pantheon Press, 1953.

Kelly, M. F., and Connolly, J. Orientation for Faculty in Junior Colleges. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph no. 10. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, 1970. (ED 043 323)

Kelley, W. and Wilbur, L. Teaching in the Community-Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Kennelly, J. R. Collective Bargaining in Higher Education in the United States: Conceptual Models and a Survey of Incidence and Extent Among Faculty and Supportive Professional Personnel: Summary Report. University of Washington, 1972.

Kohlberg, L. "The Developmental Modes of Moral Thinking in the Years Ten to Sixteen." University of Chicago, 1958 (unpublished paper)

Koile, E. and Tatem, D. "The Student Oriented Teacher." Junior College Journal. 36:24-26, February 1966.

Kurth, E. "Analysis of Degree of Faculty Satisfactions in Florida Community Junior Colleges: Final Report." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1968. (ED 027 902)

Levinson, D. Personal communication, 1973.

Loevinger, J. and Wessler, R. Measuring Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Lofquist, L. and Dawis, R. Adjustment to Work. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc., 1969.

Lombardi, J. Personal communication. 1971.

McKeachie, W. J.; Lin, Yi-Gwang; Milholland, J.; and Isaacson, R. "Student Affiliation Motives, Teacher Warmth, and Academic Achievement." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. Vol. 4, 1966.

Martin, W. B. Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education. (1st Ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954.

Medsker, L. L. The Junior College. Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Medsker, L. L. and Tillery, D. Breaking the Access Barrier: A Profile of Two-Year Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Moore, J. "The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility." Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1970. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University Microfilms. (order no. 71-6342.)

Moore, J. Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations: Pennsylvania Community College Faculty. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, 1971. (ED 051 801)

Morey, A. "Junior College Faculty: A New Breed in Higher Education." Trent, et al., The Study of Junior Colleges, Volume I. Washington, D.C.: DHEW, Contract No. OEC-0-70-4795, December, 1972.

Munday, L. A. "A Comparison of Junior College Students in Transfer and Terminal Curricula in the Two Year College and The Students: An Empirical Report." Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, Inc. 1969.

Noonan, J. F. "Faculty Development through Experimentation and Interinstitutional Cooperation." In Mervin Freedman (Ed.), Facilitating Faculty Development. New Directions for Higher Education. Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1973. Jossey-Bass.

O'Banion, T. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Parker, F. Junior College Faculty: Their Values and Perceptions. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Monograph no. 12. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971. (ED 050 725)

Patterson, R. A. Career Patterns and Educational Issues: Pennsylvania Community College Faculty. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

Purdy, L. "A Case Study of Acceptance and Rejection of Innovation by Faculty in a Community College." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1973, 230 pp.

Riess, L. "Faculty Governance in Turmoil--Who Speaks for the Junior College Professor?" Long Beach, California: Junior College Faculty Association, 1967, 12 pp. (ED 017 250)

Rogers, J. F. "Staffing our Colleges in the Present Decade." Teachers College Record. 67:(2), 1965.

Sanford, N. Where Colleges Fail: A Study of the Student as a Person. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Sanford, N. (Ed.) The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. New York: Wiley, 1962.

Sanford, N. H. Issues in Personality Theory. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Sanford, N. "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development." Soundings, Winter 1971.

Schwilck, G. I. and Martin, W. B. "Danforth's Community College Institute." New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 1 No. 1. Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Siehr, H. Problems of New Faculty Members in Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1963.

Werner, H. Comparative Psychology of Mental Development. (Rev. ed.) Chicago: Follett, 1948.

Williams, E. "Faculty Involvement in Policy Formulation in Three Selected Public Community Colleges of Oregon." Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1970. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms. (order no. 70-14, 143.)

Wilson, R. C. and Goff, J. G. "Student Voice-Faculty Response." The Research Reporter. 4(2), 1969.

Work in America: Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 197

Zion, C. and Sutton, C. "Integrated Inservice Development." New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 1 No. 1, Jossey-Bass, 1973.